



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,469	11/26/2003	John P. Karidis	ARC920030084US1	7647
7590 12/16/2008				
Frederick W. Gibb, III McGinn & Gibb, PLLC Suite 304 2568-A Riva Road Annapolis, MD 21401			EXAMINER GEDRESILASSIE, KTBROM K	
			ART UNIT 2128	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/16/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/723,469

Applicant(s)

KARIDIS ET AL.

Examiner

KIBROM K. GEBRESILASSIE

Art Unit

2128

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to amended application filed on 10/16/2008.
2. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicants are thanked for amendment/Remarks.
4. Applicant's amendment relating to 112 rejection is persuasive and therefore the rejection is **withdrawn**.
5. Applicant's argument relating to art rejection is not persuasive.
 - a. Applicants argue:

"[0009] Kushler discloses that "[t]he system of the present invention allows the user to input a word of text without having to set the stylus down on the screen to contact an intended letter and then lift the stylus from the screen again before contacting the next letter - **i.e., without having to "tap" each letter.**"

It is unclear what applicant mean by this. Does this mean Kushler enter the letters without "tapping" the letters. Is it possible to enter the letters without "tapping" each letters? If there is a touch screen having a virtual keyboard, there must be a "TAPPING" process to input each letter using the virtual keyboard.

Regardless, Kushler clearly discloses:

...to enter either word, the user would contact the touch-screen at or near the key associated with the letter
"f" pass through or near the key associated with the letter

"e" move the stylus to or near the key associated with the letter "l"...(see: Col. 10 lines 32-38),

also,

... the user proceeds to continue tapping the keyboard, then the sequence of taps generates word objects...the tap location letters concatenated in the sequence that corresponding keys are tapped (the "tap location word"...(See: Col. 20 lines 20-26).

b. Applicants argue:

"[0023] The Office Action argues that Kushler teaches "at least two tapped landing points", as recited by the claims, are represented by landing points 2212, 2214, 2216, and 2218 of Fig. 2B.

[0024] Applicants respectfully disagree that 2212, 2214, 2216, and 2218 of Fig. 2B of Kushler are analogous to the tapped landing points of the invention."

In response, as indicated in previous office action, Kushler et al clearly discloses at least two tapped landing points. For example, Figure 2B clearly shows four tapped landing points. Further, in order an input pattern analysis to operate, then there should be more than one tapped landing points to output potentially matching words from the database corresponding to letters of the word tapped or entered.

Further, Kushler et al clearly discloses:

...to enter either word, the user would contact the touch-screen at or near the key associated with the letter "f" pass through or near the key associated with the letter "e" move the

stylus to or near the key associated with the letter "l"....(see:

Col. 10 lines 32-38), i.e. analogous to at least two tapped landing points,

Also,

... the user proceeds to continue tapping the keyboard, then the sequence of taps (i.e. at least two tapped landing points as claimed invention) generates word objects...the tap location letters concatenated in the sequence that corresponding keys are tapped (the "tap location word"....(See: Col. 20 lines 20-26).

c. Applicants argue:

"[0027] The Office Action further argues that Kushler teaches "tapped landing points", as recited by the claims, are represented by landing points 2502, 2504, 2506, and 2508 of Fig. 2E.

[0028] Applicants respectfully disagree that 2502, 2504, 2506, and 2508 of Fig. 2E of Kushler are analogous to the tapped landing points of the invention."

In response, Kushler clearly discloses:

Further, Kushler et al clearly discloses:

...to enter either word, the user would contact the touch-screen at or near the key associated with the letter "f" pass through or near the key associated with the letter "e" move the stylus to or near the key associated with the letter "l"....(see:

Col. 10 lines 32-38), i.e. analogous to at least two tapped landing points,

Also,

... the user proceeds to continue tapping the keyboard, then the sequence of taps (i.e. at least two tapped landing

points as claimed invention) *generates word objects...the tap location letters concatenated in the sequence that corresponding keys are tapped (the "tap location word"....*(See: Col. 20 lines 20-26).

Further, Figs. 2B or 2E are showing tapped landing points of letters (such as landing points of 2212, 2214, 2216, 2218 of Fig. 2B or 2502, 2504, 2506, 2508 of Fig. 2E).

d. Applicant's lines of argument on par [0032] are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Further, the limitations are clearly mapped in claim rejection below and therefore they are not further addressed.

e. Applicants argue:

[0034] Applicants readily concede that the taps of Kushler, described immediately above, are analogous to the tapped landing points of the invention. However, the question remains as to whether Kushler's taps are, as described by the invention, used as inputs to a geometric pattern recognition process that "corrects" taps, which have landed outside of the intended letter keys for a word in a lexicon.

[0035] Kushler's description, "a word object comprised of the tap location letters concatenated in the sequence that the corresponding keys are tapped", teaches that his taps are literally used to construct a string of letters, as would a conventional touch screen keyboard. **That is, if the tapped keys were t-h-o-s, then the "word object" of Kushler is "thos", and not "this", which is a possible result of the invention.**

In response, examiner respectfully disagrees. Kushler et al does not only output what applicants indicated, but also all possible outcomes based on the

landing points in this case the inflection points. For example, in Fig. 2B the system is outputting the more likely matches that closer to the corresponding letter of the word such as "text", "test", "rest" , or "great" to the determined location of 2212, 2214, 2216, and 2218.

f. Applicants' argued that there is no error correction process in Kushler's et al.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

For a sake of argument, Kushler et al clearly discloses...*the pattern matching component compares the position of the inflection points extracted ...adjusting the location of the inflection points extracted from the input pattern according to these detected habitual pattern of input...* (See: Col. 19 lines 16-27), which is analogous to error correction process .

g. Applicant's lines of argument on par [0041] are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Further, the limitations are clearly mapped in claim rejection below and therefore they are not further addressed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Patent No. 7, 098, 896 issued to Kushler et al (Publication No. 2004/0140956 A1).

8. As per Claim 1, Kushler et al discloses a method of relaxing typing accuracy on a keyboard, said method comprising:

recording a sequence of at least two tapped landing points on said keyboard, each of said sequence of at least two tapped landing points having a coordinate, and said sequence of at least two tapped landing points corresponding in a one-to-one manner to a sequence of correctly or incorrectly entered letters of a word, and a tapped space bar that delimits said word (such as *...the system records the sequence of points of contact detected by the touch-screen...*; See: Col. 8 lines 11-15, Col. 20 lines 20-26);

counting a number of correctly or incorrectly entered letters of said word (such as *...records the sequence of points...*; See: Col. 8 lines 13-15);

selecting all words of a lexicon having a number of letters equal to said number of correctly or incorrectly entered letters of a said word (such as ...*after the input pattern analysis component identifies the inflection points associated with an input pattern, the pattern matching component examines the words stored in the system database to determine which words are the most likely matching candidates...*; (See: Col. 12 lines 61-65)...*the words identified as the most likely candidates by the pattern matching component are offered to the user for selection by a word selection component...*(See: Col. 18 lines 3-6); for example see Fig. 2D the number of letters equal to the number correctly entered letters also Fig. 2B));

comparing a geometric pattern (such as *pattern matching*) formed by said sequence of at least two landing points, excluding said tapped space bar, to another geometric pattern formed by said sequence of correctly or incorrectly entered letters for each selected word of said all words of a lexicon having a number of letters equal to said number of correctly or incorrectly entered letters by calculating a distance measure between said geometric pattern formed (such as ...*after the input pattern analysis component identifies the inflection points associated with an input pattern, the pattern matching component examines the words stored in the system database to determine which words are the most likely matching candidates...*; (See: Col. 12 lines 61-65) by said sequence of at least two landing points (such as ...*the expected path length for a word is calculated as the sum of the distances between the centers of the keys...*; See: Col. 13 lines 26-44), excluding said tapped space bar, and said another geometric pattern formed by letters said sequence of correctly or incorrectly entered letters for

each selected word of said all words of a lexicon having a number of letters equal to said number of correctly or incorrectly entered letters (*...the words identified as the most likely candidates by the pattern matching component are offered to the user for selection by a word selection component...*(See: Col. 18 lines 3-6; for example see Fig. 2D the number of letters equal to the number correctly entered letters));

determining a word from said selected all words of a lexicon having a number of letters equal to said number of correctly or incorrectly entered letters by selecting determining a shortest distance measure between said geometric pattern formed by said sequence of at least two tapped landing points, excluding said tapped space bar, and said another geometric pattern formed by said sequence of correctly or incorrectly entered letters for said determined word (such as *...the word selection component calculates a running average of the ratio of the actual measured length of the input pattern to the expected input path ...based on the expected input path length...the system determines which words in the database qualify as potentially matching candidates...*; See: Col. 13 lines 55-67); and

displaying, to a user, one of said determined word and said sequence of correctly or incorrectly entered letters of said word to check a correct spelling (such as *displaying the word "text", "test", "rest", for the tapping sequence of #2212-#2218...*; See: Fig. 2B).

9. As per Claim 2, Kushler et al discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein said distance measure comprises a mean distance based on summing a distance between each landing point coordinate and each corresponding center point coordinate of said correctly or incorrectly entered letters and said number of letters in said each

selected word (such as *...the expected path length for a word is calculated as the sum of the distances between the centers of the keys associated with the letters...*; See: Col. 13 lines 32-35).

10. As per Claim 3, Kushler et al discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein said distance measure comprises an elastic matching distance between each landing point coordinate and each corresponding center point coordinate of said correctly or incorrectly entered letters (such as *...the expected path length for a word is calculated as the sum of the distances between the centers of the keys...*; See: Col. 13 lines 26-44).

11. As per Claim 4, Kushler et al discloses the method according to claim 3, further comprising normalizing said elastic matching distance by said number of letters in said each selected word (such as *...identifying the optimal matching between the M letters and of a candidate word and the N identified inflection points and input pattern path segments is a variant of the "short path" problem which is well known in the field of dynamic programming...*; See: Col. 15 lines 43-60).

12. As per Claim 5, Kushler et al discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising comparing said shortest total distance measure to a threshold (such as *...the expected path length for a word is calculated as the sum of the distances between the centers of the keys...*; See: Col. 13 lines 26-44).

13. As per Claim 6, Kushler et al discloses the method according to claim 5, further comprising displaying said determined word, if said shortest distance measure is smaller than said threshold otherwise displaying said sequence of correctly or

incorrectly entered letters (such as *displaying the word "text", "test", "rest", for the tapping sequence of #2212-#2218...*; See: Fig. 2B).

14. As per Claim 7, Kushler et al discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein each tapped landing point comprises moving a finger or a stylus from a first position not contacting said keyboard, to a second position contacting said keyboard at said each landing point, and to a third position not contacting said keyboard (such as *...the user proceeds to continue tapping the keyboard, then the sequence of taps generates a word object...following the second tap, this words composed of the tap location letters...*; See: Col. 20 lines 20-26).

15. As per Claim 8, Kushler et al discloses a method of relaxing typing accuracy on a computer keyboard, said method comprising:

recording sequence of at least two tapped landing points on said keyboard, each of said sequence of at least two tapped landing points having a coordinate, and said sequence of at least two tapped landing points corresponding in a one-to-one manner to a sequence of correctly or incorrectly entered letters of a word, and a tapped space bar that delimits said word (such as *...the system records the sequence of points of contact detected by the touch-screen...*; See: Col. 8 lines 11-15);

counting a number of correctly or incorrectly entered letters of said word (such as *...records the sequence of points...*; See: Col. 8 lines 13-15);

selecting all words of a lexicon having a same number of letters equal to said number of correctly or incorrectly entered letters of said word (such as *...after the input pattern analysis component identifies the inflection points associated with an input*

pattern, the pattern matching component examines the words stored in the system database to determine which words are the most likely matching candidates...; (See: Col. 12 lines 61-65)...the words identified as the most likely candidates by the pattern matching component are offered to the user for selection by word selection component...(See: Col. 18 lines 3-6));

for said all words having said number of letters, computing a distance between a landing point coordinate and a corresponding center point coordinate of said correctly or incorrectly entered letter of said word for each landing point in said sequence of at least two tapped landing points (such as *...the location of each displayed texts character key is defined by the screen coordinates of the center of the key, which is the location used when determining the distance of letter associated with the key...; See: Col. 8 lines 25-31, Col. 20 lines 20-26);*

for each word of said all words having said number of letters, computing a mean distance based on summing each said distance between a landing point coordinate and a corresponding center point coordinate of said correctly or incorrectly entered letter of said each word and said number of letters in said each word (such as *...the expected path length for a word is calculated as the sum of the distances between the centers of the keys associated with the letters...; See: Col. 13 lines 30-35); and*

determining a word from said selected all words of a lexicon having a number of letters equal to said number of correctly or incorrectly entered letters by determining a shortest mean distance between said sequence of at least two landing points, excluding said space bar, and said sequence of correctly or incorrectly entered letters for said

determined word (such as ...*the word selection component calculates a running average of the ratio of the actual measured length of the input pattern to the expected input path ...based on the expected input path length...the system determines which words in the database qualify as potentially matching candidates...*; See: Col. 13 lines 55-67); and

displaying, to a user, said determined word and said sequence of correctly or incorrectly entered letters of said word to check a correct spelling (such as *displaying the word "text", "test", "rest", for the tapping sequence of #2212-#2218...*; See: Fig. 2B)..

16. As per Claim 9, Kushler et al discloses the method according to claim 8, wherein said keyboard comprises one of a physical keyboard, a virtual keyboard, a stylus keyboard, a graphical keyboard, and a touch-screen (such as ..*virtual keyboard or touch-screen...*; See: Fig. 2A).

17. As per Claims 10-22, the instant claims recite substantially same limitation as the above rejected claims 1-7, and 9, and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIBROM K. GEBRESILASSIE whose telephone number is (571)272-8571. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:30 pm Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah can be reached on 571-272-2279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kamini S Shah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2128

/Kibrom K Gebresilassie/
Examiner, Art Unit 2128